PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY FROM G. CALEB ALEXANDER

EXHIBIT D

GEORGE A. BARRETT DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT (09-21-2020)

```
Page 1
1
            IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
         FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
 2
 3
 4
     THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON,
 5
               Plaintiff,
6
                                         CIVIL ACTION
     vs.
 7
                                       NO. 3:17-01362
     AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG
     CORPORATION, et al.,
8
9
               Defendants.
10
11
     CABELL COUNTY COMMISSION,
12
                Plaintiff,
13
     vs.
                                              CIVIL ACTION
                                            NO. 3:17-01665
14
     AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG
     CORPORATION, et al.,
15
                Defendants.
16
17
18
19
              Videotaped and videoconference deposition
     of GEORGE A. BARRETT taken by the Defendants under
     the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in the above-
20
     entitled action, pursuant to notice, before Teresa
2.1
     S. Evans, a Registered Merit Reporter, all parties
     located remotely, on the 21st day of September,
     2020.
2.2
23
2.4
```

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com

888-391-3376

professional practice articles published in the Journal of Forensic Economics, that tells us that a 30-year average is the industry standard in forensic economics, and so when we back up and we use the 30-year average, it comes out to be 2.5 percent.

So you do see that this rate is increased, but across a longer period of time, it's stationary. It's stable over a longer period of time, it's not fluctuating as radically.

For example, as recently as 2019, you see that that rate of increase was actually 2.56 percent. So if we just went back one year and looked at what happened most recently with regard to this category, the rate of increase was actually 2.56 percent, whereas the historical average has been 2.5.

- Q. Okay. Why don't we move to the next tab, which is 1E1, Syringe Service Programs.
 - A. Okay.

2.4

- Q. Do you know whether there are existing syringe service programs in the Cabell/Huntington community today?
 - A. No, I'm not. And again, in this category,

just like the previous, Doctor Alexander provided the number of opioid injection drug users reached by the syringe service program. He also provided with -- provided in the redress model the cost per client for the syringe service program.

- Q. Did you make any effort to determine the cost of existing syringe service programs in the Cabell/Huntington community in connection with your work?
- A. No. Again, Doctor Alexander provided this information, and I relied upon his opinion for these calculations.
- Q. And with respect to existing syringe service programs, do you know who has provided the funding for those, whether it's come from the County or City or alternatively, from some Federal or State source?
- A. No. But again, just like we've talked about with these other costs, even if such a program was being funded by another party, the intention from this particular redress model is to identify and effectively deal with the costs that have been created by the opioid epidemic.

So if some other funding mechanism or

some other agency was perhaps paying for this, typically we would not expect the defense to get a benefit from that just because they were lucky enough to have triggered an opioid epidemic in a geographic area which was providing a syringe program in the first place.

- Q. Well, as far as you know, has the City or County ever funded, in whole or in part, a syringe service program using its own funds?
- A. I believe that there was and have been some programs with regards to a syringe collection effort. I do recall that -- those types of programs and those types of costs have existed.
- Q. So you are aware that -- of a syringe collection program taking place within the geographic boundaries of the City or County, but do you know who funded any such program?
- A. No. Again, I'm not familiar with that, and I think that that would be irrelevant because it would -- it would be in violation of the collateral source rule as it relates to whether or not a defendant gets the benefit of a third party participating in and contributing toward the funding of one of -- any of these types of

programs.

- Q. Well, under the collateral source rule, if somebody makes an expenditure that is later reimbursed, you're saying the defendant can't necessarily benefit from that. What I'm asking is: Has the County or City ever even in fact even made the expenditure, or are those programs just funded by others?
 - A. I'm not certain of that.

MR. BURNETT: I'll just make a general objection to the extent the question calls for a legal conclusion.

- Q. In your annual growth cost growth rate in this category, what -- what comparable, you know -- how did you come up with this cost growth rate that you use here, and how does that compare with syringe service programs?
- A. The future value growth rate inflationary category that I utilized is from the medical care commodities category for medical cost price inflation, and that includes medical equipment, essentially. So the types of costs that would be associated with this type of a program would be dealing with medical equipment because we're